

Date: Fri, 4 Nov 94 04:30:23 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: List
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #519
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 4 Nov 94 Volume 94 : Issue 519

Today's Topics:

 CW: Law or Choice ?
 NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULletins
 Questions on This and That

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 3 Nov 1994 02:18:07 GMT
From: kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com>
Subject: CW: Law or Choice ?

In <1994Oct31.175418.26826@clark.dgim.doc.ca> jcumming@dgim.doc.ca (Jim Cummings)
writes:

>I wonder what would happen if the points awards from each CW contact were
>reduced to 1 point instead of the current 2 points would have an effect?
>Some would say no, but I think otherwise.

I agree. I've heard no shortage of comments here about how great
CW is at cutting through the QRM, QRN and the like. And let's
not forget how God-awful efficient it is as far a bandwidth too.
In that light, why is the BEST mode of communication given the
most amount of points? Should not the opposite be true? At the
very least, should not ALL modes stand on their own merit and
receive equivalent points?

CW affirmative action: when will it end?

>73 and live better digitally

I love it! I feel a new (and borrowed) sig comming on! :-))
At least time and technology is on the side of us digital weenies!!

>Jim, VE3XJ

Kevin, N9SQB, amateur radio and political Libertarian

Date: 3 Nov 1994 18:14:40 GMT
From: hanko@wv.mentorg.com (Hank Oredson)
Subject: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULletins

In article <1994Nov2.032455.26815@news.csuohio.edu>, sww@csuohio.edu (Steve Wolf) writes:

|> Hank Oredson (hanko@wv.mentorg.com) wrote:
|> : Nope, because AX.25, by it's very nature, is not used for one-
|> : way communications. Oh yes, you might say, it COULD be
|> : (there are UI frames!), but it's not.
|> :
|> :
|> But is is broadcasting none the less.
|> :
|> I think it was Todd Little that that quoted the definition of broadcasting.
|> :
|> From Part 97.3(a) ... (10) ... Broadcasting - Transmissions intended for
|> reception by the general public, either direct or relayed.

Steve, try real hard here ... read the above ... about "transmissions" and "general public" and "intended". Give it a shot, you can probably figure out what those words mean.

|> :
|> Clearly, a BBS phone port with a annonymous check-in allows the public access
|> to relayed transmissions. There are LOTS of phone ports that allow
|> anonymous check-ins.

Wrong. It allows the public (if the sysop so chooses) access to some files on a computer. Has nothing (zilch, zip, nada) to do with "transmissions" or "broadcasting" or for that matter "radio", not to mention "amateur radio".

Try really hard Steve, this is NOT rocket science.
The words really do mean just what they say. Amazing!

|> So, originators of bulletins which are sent by any means to a BBS that has
|> a public phone port that are not about amateur radio would fall under
|> broadcasting.

Would you like to run this by me again?

|> Broadcasting does not require a one-way transmission. It would appear that
|> an ax.25 connection between two stations can still be use for broadcasting.

Um, how could that happen?

Steve, you are REAL confused here. Go back to the definitions section
of part 97, and read that first. Make some notes on what the various
technical terms ("transmissions", "broadcasting", "transmitted")
mean, then read the above again.

|> (Bet we are going to move on and say that a bulletin about quilting was
|> targeted solely at the amateur population. Let me guess ... ANY bulletin
|> entered on packet is to be assumed to be aimed solely at the amateur radio
|> population.)

Ah! You have GOT it at last!

Who ELSE would an amateur station transmit this information to?
In fact, it would not be legal for an amateur station to transmit
this information to anyone BUT another ham.

By "targeted" you probably mean exactly the same thing that the FCC
means with the term "intended" in part 97.3

Simple, isn't it?

I'm still curious what you are attempting to accomplish with the
arguments you are making. What's your agenda?

... Hank

--

Hank Oredson @ Mentor Graphics	Library Operations
Internet : hank_oredson@mentorg.com	"Parts 'R Us!"
Amateur Radio: WORLI@WORLI.OR.USA.NOAM	

Date: 2 Nov 1994 01:06:09 GMT
From: Jim.Devenport.WB5AOX@ucsd.edu (jdevenport@lanl.gov)

Subject: Questions on This and That

:>This (the shave & a haircut story) sounds like pure myth to me.
:>Anyone have any actual references (i.e. QST articles/story) to
:>back up this claim? Not meant as a flame, just want to
:>validate this story.
:>
:>--
:>Bill Sohl K2UNK (billsohl@planet.net)
:>Budd Lake, New Jersey

I sure dunno the "TRUE ORIGIN" of the shave-and-a-haircut tappey tap tap but know my dad used it sometimes on the door and saw the same done in movies during the 1960's. Back in the early 1970's when I was still very active in CW, many many QSO's ENDED with the 1st op sending (.) and the other op sending the last 2 dits to complete the jingle. I'm much too new to ham radio (only active since 1970 to present with an ill-fated 1 year stint as a Novice in 1963) to have been around when the QSO's used the exchange as a form of CQ.
Jim Devenport WB5AOX (jdevenport@lanl.gov)

Date: 3 Nov 1994 02:27:41 GMT
From: pcr@ic.net (phil reed)

References<395ur8\$uic@snoopy.jh.org> <398, <Cynp9B.MAE@wang.com>
Subject: Re: NoCal 00 goes after Packet BULLETins

In article <Cynp9B.MAE@wang.com>, dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) says:
>
>little@iamu.chi.dec.com (Todd Little) writes:
>
>>Not so. No where in Part 97 is the notion of "intent" for the content
>>of a message covered.
>
>It would have been good if you had read the rules before making such a
>statement:
>
> {deletia, to save bandwidth}
>
>Two people having an interactive conversation about the weather, about
>their hamshacks, is what ham radio is all about. A thousand computers
>forwarding cookie recipes to ALL@USBBS is not what ham radio is about.
>You know it, I know it, and this discussion has become astoundingly
>boring and tedious, so while it may sadden a great many forward-
>thinkers, I'm going to terminate my participation in it.

>
>73,
>Dave, KZ10
>
>--
>Dave Bushong
>OPEN/image Recognition Products

Lots of verbiage, debating a relatively simple issue. Here's my take on the discussion:

The problem is simple: there are two levels operating here. You are saying that the cookie recipe is the relevant part, that this is 'broadcasting' or whatever, and not true ham radio communications. Other people are saying that the station-to-station packet connection is the relevant level, and what is contained in the packet is less or not relevant.

Here, I'm going to have to cast my vote with the station-to-station view. Makes more sense to me.

...phil / kb8uoy

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #519
